UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/671,463	09/29/2003	Hidehiko Fujiwara	Q77726	7948

23373 7590 07/05/2007

SUGHRUE MION, PLLC
2100 PENNSYLVANIA AVENUE, N.W.
SUITE 800
WASHINGTON, DC 20037

EXAMINER	
SHAN, APRIL YING	

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2135	

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
07/05/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/671,463	FUJIWARA ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	April Y. Shan	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *18 April 2007*.

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-32* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-11 and 13-32* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☒ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) ☐ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date *3 April 2007*.
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application
6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Response to Amendment

1. The Applicant's amendment, filed 18 April 2007, has been received, entered into the record, and respectfully and fully considered.

2. As a result of the amendment, claims 1, 4-7, 9-11, 13, 17, 20, 23-24 and 26 have been amended. Claim 12 is cancelled. Claims 1- 11 and 13-32 are now presented for examination.

3. Any objections/rejections not repeated below for record are withdrawn due to Applicant's amendment.

Information Disclosure Statement

4. The information disclosure statement filed 3 April 2007 fails to comply with 37 CFR 1.98(a)(3) because it does not include a concise explanation of the relevance, as it is presently understood by the individual designated in 37 CFR 1.56(c) most knowledgeable about the content of the information, of each patent listed that is not in the English language. Although the Applicant provides a pertinent portion of an English translated corresponding Japanese Office Action, it fails to include a concise explanation of the relevance of the two NPL Japanese references and the instant application. Additionally, FUJITA, Ken, et al., "Hot Spots That Can Turn a Street Corner into an Office," Telecommunications, No. 219, October 2002, pages 26-44 does not have pages 26-44 as the Applicant cited on the IDS. It has been placed in the application file, but the information referred to therein has not been considered.

Specification

5. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of the content.

Applicant is reminded of the proper content of an abstract of the disclosure.

A patent abstract is a concise statement of the technical disclosure of the patent and should include that which is new in the art to which the invention pertains. If the patent is of a basic nature, the entire technical disclosure may be new in the art, and the abstract should be directed to the entire disclosure. If the patent is in the nature of an improvement in an old apparatus, process, product, or composition, the abstract should include the technical disclosure of the improvement. In certain patents, particularly those for compounds and compositions, wherein the process for making and/or the use thereof are not obvious, the abstract should set forth a process for making and/or use thereof. If the new technical disclosure involves modifications or alternatives, the abstract should mention by way of example the preferred modification or alternative.

The abstract should not refer to purported merits or speculative applications of the invention and should not compare the invention with the prior art.

Where applicable, the abstract should include the following:
(1) if a machine or apparatus, its organization and operation;
(2) if an article, its method of making;
(3) if a chemical compound, its identity and use;
(4) if a mixture, its ingredients;
(5) if a process, the steps.

Extensive mechanical and design details of apparatus should not be given.

Correction is required. Also, the Applicant is respectfully reminded **no new matter should be added** in the abstract while addressing this objection.

Claim Objections

6. Claims 1-3, 5-11, 13-19 and 21-32 are objected to because of the following informalities:

a. In claim 1, the whole claim is grammatically incomprehensible. For example, "logging-in to a network" should be "logging to network". Also, "...is a subject of authentication when....". Who log in to network?

Any claim not specifically addressed, above, is being objected as incorporating the deficiencies of a claim upon which it depends.

Please check the claims and correct any informality the Applicant is aware of. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

7. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

> The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

8. The **claims 1-11 and 13-32** are generally narrative and indefinite, failing to conform with current U.S. practice. They appear to be a literal translation into English from a foreign document and are replete with grammatical and idiomatic error. Further, the preamble of claims 1-11 and 13-16 is a method claim, however, the body of the claims does not recite method of steps. Is the Applicant's intention to claim an apparatus or a method?

As per **claim 6**, it recites "based on the advertisements as the subject of the request", lacks of an antecedent basis.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

9. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

> A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –
>
> (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

10. Claims 1-7, 15-23 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by the Applicant's admitted prior art by Jun (Japanese Patent Laid-open 2001-266018. The below rejections are based on the Machine English translation copy provided by Japanese Patent Office)

As per **claim 1**, Jun discloses an internet connection service providing method, wherein service classes each for each user as a subject of authentication of log-in in network are preset ("...Vender Q set up beforehand the content of the service offered for every customer ID..." – e.g. paragraph [0032]), a service class preset for a logged-in user is recognized ("...which is transmitted in addition to this, and holds it, and every which this connects..." – e.g. paragraph [0032]), and a service corresponding to a recognized service class to a pertinent user based on the recognition is provided ("...customer P is provided with the content of service..." – e.g. paragraph [0032]).

As per **claim 2**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein a fee corresponding to the service class is computed based on fee managing data and charged to the pertinent user (e.g. paragraph [0005], [0010]).

As per **claim 3**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein an applicable service class is preset for each user on the basis of a contract (e.g. abstract).

As per **claims 4 and 20**, Jun discloses an internet connection service providing method, wherein a particular ISP (internet service provider) (paragraph [0059]) provides an internet connection service in a plurality of places ("outside a metaphor house" – e.g. paragraph [0059]), and user management data concerning service classes preset for individual users and service class correspondence data representing service contents corresponding to the service classes are provided as a system in the ISP (e.g. paragraph [0059]), and a service corresponding to each user utilizing the internet connection service is provided (e.g. paragraph [0059]), as desired, based on the user management data and the service class correspondence data irrespective of connection from any one of the plurality of places (e.g. paragraph [0059]).

As per **claim 5**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein advertisement data which have been preliminarily received from an advertisement requester and accumulated are distributed to logged-in users in correspondence to pertinent service classes (e.g. paragraph [0030]).

As per **claim 6**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 5. Jun further discloses wherein utilization or communication service fees concerning the distribution of the advertisement data to the pertinent users are covered by advertisement fee paid by the advertisement requester to the ISP based on advertisements as the subject of the request (e.g. paragraph [0031]).

As per **claim 7**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein the advertisement data preliminarily received from the advertisement requester and accumulated are further distributed to the pertinent users based on advertisement distribution requests therefrom (e.g. paragraph [0050], [0055]).

As per **claim 15**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein the service classes of the logged-in users are recognized (e.g. "...which is transmitted in addition to this, and holds it, and every which this connects..." – e.g. paragraph [0032]), and services classified by predetermined communication qualities are provided to users (e.g. paragraph [0028]).

As per **claim 16**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein the service classes of the logged-in users are recognized (e.g. paragraph [0032]), and services classified based on the kinds of preset accessible media and protocol are provided to users in correspondence to recognized service classes (e.g. paragraph [0028]).

As per **claims 17 and 18**, Jun discloses an internet connection service system applicable for carrying out the method as set forth in claim 1, comprising a network managing server for managing the network utilization state of each of a plurality of users (e.g. paragraph [0032]), a rooter for connecting the system to internet (e.g. paragraph [0030]), and a service server (e.g. paragraph [0031]), the service server being arranged

to provide services and charge fees to the users based on service class data for managing service classes capable of being utilized by the users and fee management data for managing the state of fee charging for each user and wherein the fee management data constitutes the basis of charging a fee corresponding to the service class of each user (e.g. paragraph [0031]).

As per **claim 19**, Jun discloses an internet connection service system according to claim 1, wherein the service class data are built up by preliminarily setting, by contracts, service classes each applicable to each user (e.g. abstract and paragraph [0032]).

As per **claims 21-23**, Jun discloses an internet connection service system according to claim 17, which further comprises an advertisement distributing server for accumulating advertisement data preliminarily received from advertisement requester and distributing the accumulated advertisement data to the users (e.g. paragraph [0050]), the advertisement distributing server being applicable to distribute advertisement data to pertinent logged-in users corresponding to service classes recognized by data in the service server (e.g. paragraph [0050]), wherein the service server is arranged such as not to charge any fee for advertisement distribution and communication services required therefor to users (e.g. paragraph [0050]), wherein the service server includes a service class correspondence table for managing the service classes such as to fit advertisement distribution requests each from each user and a fee

managing table for managing fees for each user (e.g. paragraph [0031] and [0050]), and distributes advertisement data received from the advertisement requester and accumulated to the pertinent users based on the service class correspondence table to meet the user's advertisement distribution requests (e.g. paragraph [0050]).

As per **claim 32**, Jun discloses a system as applied above in claim 21. Jun further discloses comprises an access control unit for limiting communication media according to preset sections provided for the user's service classes, respectively, and the service server includes a media managing table, in which an accessible media and a protocol are defined for each service class (e.g. paragraph [0028]).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

11. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

> (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

12. The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham* **v.** *John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.

3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

13. This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

14. Claims 8-11, 13-14 and 24-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over by the Applicant's admitted prior art by Jun (Japanese Patent Laid-open 2001-266018. The below rejections are based on the Machine English translation copy provided by Japanese Patent Office)

As per **claim 8**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 7.

Jun does not disclose expressly wherein an amount obtained by subtracting an advertisement reading fee corresponding to the number of times and frequency of advertisement reading from the internet connection service fee is charged. However, Jun discloses in the abstract "The information management center frees users from a portion charged to them of the charge for the internet connection under prescribed conditions" and in the paragraph [0004], Jun discloses "..it is no charge or an Internet

access service can be received cheaply and easily. For a vendor while increasing an opportunity to supply the advertisement of own goods to a customer...".

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that prescribed conditions includes subtracting an advertisement reading fee corresponding to the number of times and frequency of advertisement reading from the internet connection service fee is charged. The motivation of doing so would have been "for a customer even if it is outside a metaphor house, it is no charge or an Internet access service can be received cheaply and easily. For a vendor while increasing an opportunity to supply the advertisement of own goods to a customer", as taught by Jun (paragraph [0004]).

As per **claim 9**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 8.

Jun does not disclose expressly wherein the number of times of advertisement reading as the basis of discount computation or a value obtained by multiplying the number by a coefficient or a numerical value corresponding to frequency or degree is accumulated and updated as points. However, Jun discloses in the abstract "The information management center frees users from a portion charged to them of the charge for the internet connection under prescribed conditions", in the paragraph [0004], Jun discloses "..it is no charge or an Internet access service can be received cheaply and easily. For a vendor while increasing an opportunity to supply the advertisement of own goods to a customer..." and Jun discloses in the paragraph [0032], "...unites the member point balance given to Customer P as a privilege in the purchase..."

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the number of times of advertisement reading as the basis of discount computation or a value obtained by multiplying the number by a coefficient or a numerical value corresponding to frequency or degree is accumulated in the prescribed conditions. The motivation of doing so would have been "for a customer even if it is outside a metaphor house, it is no charge or an Internet access service can be received cheaply and easily. For a vendor while increasing an opportunity to supply the advertisement of own goods to a customer", as taught by Jun (paragraph [0004]).

As per **claim 10**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 9. Jun further discloses wherein the points are as well accumulated and updated with respect to users, who have read advertisements accumulated in ISP managing a system for counting the points from the outside via the internet (e.g. paragraph [0032]).

As per **claims 11 and 13**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 1. Jun further discloses wherein advertisement data preliminarily received from the advertisement requester and accumulated are distributed to logged-in users (e.g. paragraph [0030]), Jun further discloses wherein a status that advertisement data accumulated by the advertisement requester have been read by the user via the internet (paragraph [0028] and Jun further discloses wherein a status that the user has

read advertisements by accessing a system, which is managed by an advertisement distributing dealer ("Vendor Q" – e.g. paragraph [0030]) accumulating and possessing advertisement data concerning advertisements requested by an advertisement requester, via the internet (e.g. paragraph [0030])

Jun is silent on the distribution history such as the number of times and degree of the distribution is accumulated and updated for each advertisement of the advertisement data. However, in the paragraph [0030], Jun discloses "...Various processing programs, such as data, each vender's Q original advertising information, and an information offer processing program for transmitting the predetermined information and the various predetermined messages of goods to Customer P according to the demand from a consumer premises equipment 2, are stored in the hard disk store 327".

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made that stored data/information includes distribution history and the updated distribution history. The motivation of doing so would have been "for a customer even if it is outside a metaphor house, it is no charge or an Internet access service can be received cheaply and easily. For a vendor while increasing an opportunity to supply the advertisement of own goods to a customer", as taught by Jun (paragraph [0004]).

As per **claim 14**, Jun discloses a method as applied above in claim 13. Jun further discloses wherein the system, which is managed by an advertisement

management dealer accumulating and possessing advertisement data concerning advertisements requested by an advertisement requester (e.g. paragraph [0030]), possesses distribution record data obtained by recording the number of times and degree of advertisement distribution for obtaining a fee corresponding to the number of times and frequency of the advertisement distribution from the advertisement requester (see above rejection in claim 13).

As per **claims 24-26**, they are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claims 8-9 and 11.

As per **claim 27**, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 11.

As per **claim 28**, it is rejected using the same rationale as for the rejection of claim 11.

As per **claims 29-30**, they are rejected using the same rationale as for the rejections of claims 11-14.

15. Claim 31 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Applicant's admitted prior art by Jun (Japanese Patent Laid-open 2001-266018. The below rejections are based on the Machine English translation copy provided by Japanese Patent Office) as applied to claims 1-30 above, and further in view of Applicant's admitted prior art by Kawano (Japanese Patent Laid-open 2001-298484.

The below rejections are based on the Machine English translation copy provided by Japanese Patent Office)

As per **claim 31**, Jun discloses a system as applied above in claim 21.

Jun does not disclose expressly comprises a QoS (quality of service) unit for controlling a preset QoS for each user's service class, and the service server has a communication quality managing table, in which communication qualities of services are preset.

Kawano discloses comprises a QoS (quality of service) unit for controlling a preset QoS for each user's service class, and the service server has a communication quality managing table, in which communication qualities of services are preset (e.g. abstract, paragraph [0015] and [0039]-[0040]).

Accordingly, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to incorporate a QoS (quality of service) unit for controlling a preset QoS for each user's service class, and the service server has a communication quality managing table, in which communication qualities of services are preset to Jun's system.

The motivation of doing so would have been for a user "to choose freely the service conditions of a network service to use at every connection and can specify them when connecting with a network from a user terminal and has the effectiveness of becoming possible to offer the network service according to the service condition", as taught by Kawano (paragraph [0039])

Response to Arguments

16. Applicant's arguments filed 18 April 2007 have been respectfully and fully considered but they are not persuasive.

17. The Applicant's essential argument of the Applicant (See remark pages 14-17) on term "service class" and related features in claims 1, 4, 17 and 20 are not recited in the Jun reference, the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, the Applicant is respectfully reminded that although the claims are interpreted in light of the specification, limitations from the specification are **not** read into the claims. See In re Van Geuns, 988 F. 2d 1181, 26 USPQ2d 1057 (Fed. Cir. 1993) The term "service class" should not be limited to preferred embodiments in the specification. The word should take on the ordinary and customary meaning attributed to it by those of ordinary skill in the art. *See In re ACTV, Inc. v. The Walt Disney Company,* 346 F.3d 1082, 1092, 68 USPQ2d 1516, 1524 (Fed. Cir. 2003) *and In re E-Pass Technologies, Inc. v. 3Com Corporation,* 343 F.3d 1364, 1368, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1949 (Fed. Cir. 2003). Also,

Second, the examiner respectfully notes that in paragraph [0032], Jun discloses "...Vender Q set up **beforehand the content of the service** offered for every customer ID...", "...which is transmitted in addition to this, and holds it, and every which this connects.." and "...**customer P is provided with the content of service**...". Also in claim 12, Jun discloses "it connected with..while generating said **service information based on said customer information memorized beforehand** and transmitting said

service information to said consumer premise equipment" that of the Jun in fact teaches the claim limitation. Therefore it met the limitation of service class.

Third, the Applicant argues on page 14, "...the level of services is not factored into the computation because such a level does not exist", the examiner respectfully responds that "**the level of services**..." is not recited in claim 1.

Fourth, the Applicant argues on page 14, "The Applicant's claim discloses features specific to service classes", the examiner respectfully responds that "service classes" is not recited in claim 1. Instead, the claim 1 recites "a service class". Please note "service classes" is not same as "a service class".

18. Regarding Applicant's argument on page 17 towards the dependent claims 8-14 and 24-31 being allowable due to dependency. However, because the arguments for the independent claims are traversed, the dependent claims are also not allowable.

19. Regarding Applicant's argument on pages 17-18, "the Applicant's use of QoS is distinct to that of Kawano. Referring to Fig. 24..", the examiner respectfully disagrees.

First, according to MPEP § 2106, 8th Ed. Rev. 5, "USPTO personnel are to give **claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure.** In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). **Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim should not be read into the claim.** E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily). In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550- 551 (CCPA

1969). See also In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320,1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("**During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.**").

Second, the examiner acknowledges that the Applicant agrees with the examiner "that Kawano does teach using a QoS method to distinguish service class" on page 18 of the remark.

Conclusion

20. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to April Y. Shan whose telephone number is (571) 270-1014. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00 a.m. - 5:00 p.m., EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Y. Vu can be reached on (571) 272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

AYS

22 June 2007
AYS

KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100